DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 168 EA 011 446

AUTHOR Glanz, Jeffrey
TITLE The Bureaucratic-Professional Dilemma for Supervisors and Curriculum Workers in Schools: An Historical Analysis of a Persistent Problem.
PUB DATE 11 Apr 79
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *Administrative Problems; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Bureaucracy; *Curriculum; Decision Making; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Individual Power; Power Structure; Professional Personnel; *School Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Curriculum Specialists; Professional Autonomy

ABSTRACT

A persistent problem for supervisors and curriculum workers has been the unresolved tension between the demands of the organization and the drive for professionalism. Emerging in the late nineteenth century, the problem was greatly influenced by the transformation of the school system along bureaucratic lines. Supervisors and curriculum workers during the early decades of the new century tried to counteract past bureaucratic influences by attempting to professionalize. Supervisors and curriculum workers attempting to improve instruction and make curriculum more valid were hindered by bureaucratic rules and regulations. The problem became increasingly apparent to supervisors and curriculum workers toward the middle 1930s. Because of the exigencies of the organizational framework of schooling, it is doubtful that even present day supervisors and curricularists are able to attain their professional goals. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED168168

THE BUREAUCRATIC-PROFESSIONAL DILEMMA FOR SUPERVISORS AND CURRICULUM WORKERS IN SCHOOLS: AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF A PERSISTENT PROBLEM

Jeffrey Glanz

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
American Educational Research Association
Division F, History and Historiography

San Francisco

April 11, 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Glanz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EA 011 446

It would not be inaccurate to assume that people in sub-fields of education, such as curriculum, supervision or administration, have varying degrees of consciousness regarding their historical traditions. The degree to which educators, in general, have attempted to examine their inherited modes of behavior and action has certainly been miniscule. Different attitudes have been conveyed concerning the lack of historical awareness into educational problems and issues. On the one hand, some historians have tended to lament the ahistorical nature of educational thought and practice. On the other hand, some educationists have expressed ambivalent views concerning the useful and pragmatic consequences of historical inquiry. In recent years, however, the number of historical studies in education and its sub-specialties has markedly increased. To a greater degree than ever before, history, as a mode of inquiry, has been recognized as a valuable resource for the contemporary educator. But what indeed can history offer us? I believe historical analysis can help us understand the antecedents of our present circumstance. By vitally and dynamically recounting history we possess the knowledge, indeed the wisdom, in which to explore contemporary issues, analyze current proposals, and discover new directions. I am not convinced, however, that historical exploration will alter existing conditions in our schools, but there remains a strong belief that we can begin, perhaps, to understand and become aware of the problems which have plagued supervision and curriculum in schools. It is hoped that this paper will contribute to our understanding and historical conscicusness. Further, it is my hope that this effort will stimulate greater analytical and interpretive study into the historical foundations of supervision and curriculum and how these two fields have contributed to shaping an educational profession.

Historians, in my estimation, have not addressed themselves to the

perplexing and persistent issues that have served to define both the curriculum and supervisory fields. Few, if any, studies have attempted to examine the historical relationship between supervision and curriculum.[1] This is unfortunate since both fields have shared much in their intellectual traditions and history. An historical examination of the function and position of supervision in relation to developing curriculum is important for at least three reasons. First, it provides considerable insight into the concepts of teaching and learning and how these educational notions have changed over time.[2] Specialists have frequently conceived of their subject fields as encompassing all, rather than a part, of education. This has certainly been true of curriculum workers and supervisors. Historically, both fields engaged in their activities without considering the important interrelatiorships involved in supervising teaching and developing curriculum and learning materials in schools. For many years supervision and curriculum development were conceived as separate and distinct parts in the educative process. This development was perhaps quite natural considering the historical underpinings of each field. Supervision[3] had its roots in administration not curriculum. Supervision was presumed to be concerned with the "how to teach." Its basic orientation was traditionally on method. Often supervisory method, especially in the late nineteenth century, succumbed to a bureaucratic and control orientation.[4] Despite its shortcomings, the field of supervision was practically based in the classroom - affecting both teaching and learning. Curriculum,[5] on the other hand, was much farther removed from the classroom setting. Although curriculum was concerned with the "what to teach," its emphasis on writing courses of study and theoretical formulations of what was to be taught and learned had little impact on classroom practice. Decker Walker notes that "most teachers ignored the course of study anyway."[6] This was largely due to the fact that the curriculum

field emerged from the work of university-based curriculum makers.[7] The schism between theory and practice was present during the early days of the curriculum field. It was not until the curriculum field made its historic connection with supervision that a greater impact was made on teaching and learning in the classroom. Curriculum workers came to realize in the 1930s that writing courses of study and making curricula did little to change instruction. They recognized that for curricular proposals to be effective they had to become concerned with the process of change in the classroom. They viewed supervision as a most potent means for curriculum implementation and change. In the 1930s supervision and curriculum were finally conceived as cooperative and related functions.[8] The fundamental query, in this context, that needs scrutiny is "given the disparate historical trends of both fields, how and why did supervisors and curriculum workers eventually merge to form a national, professional organization?"[9] To understand this alliance between these two groups is to, in part, become aware of what supervisors and curricularists came to realize by the mid-thirties; that is, to initiate curricular change without dealing with both the "what to teach" and "how to teach," and without considering school governance and institutional variables that supervision attended to was sheer folly.

A second reason why an analysis of supervision and curriculum from a historical perspective is valuable is that it provides insight into how curriculum was planned and organized in schools across the country and the role supervision played in its implementation. To understand curriculum and, at least a part of, curriculum history one must necessarily examine the coordinated efforts made by supervisors and curriculum workers in revising courses of study in cities such as Denver and Detroit. The fact of the matter is that curriculum specialists were engaged with supervisors in coordinating curricular programs.[10] To overlook this fact

is to obtain a narrow and incomplete curriculum history. Examining the nature of this coordinated effort between supervisors and curricularists and how this alliance contributed to the professionalization of both groups is essential.

A third reason for examining supervision and curriculum historically is that it uniquely highlights the problems confronting school functionaries striving to attain professionalism within a bureaucracy. An historical examination of a fifty year period, from the late nineteenth century through the fourth decade of the twentieth century, reveals that two related, but sometimes opposing, processes, bureaucracy and professionalism, helped shape the function and position of supervision and curriculum in schools. This historical analysis indicates a characteristic tension for supervisors and curricularists in their attempts to actualize themselves within the bureaucratic framework of schooling. Supervisors and curricularists as middle management personnel confronted certain problems that seemed, at times, insurmountable. Decker Walker described the curriculum specialist as working within the confines of a "school district administrative hierarchy" where he remained in the "limbo of middle management."[11] Elsewhere I have indicated that the supervisor found himself in a similar awkward position in the public schools.[12] Torn between his administrative duties and instructional responsibilities, the supervisor found it difficult to function professionally within a bureaucratic hierarchy. The tensions created for supervisors and curriculum workers by membership in a bureaucratic organization are central to this discussion.

The primary intent of this paper, then, is to examine, in an interpretive-historical mode, a persistent and intractable problem for supervisors and curriculum workers; namely, the unresolved dilemma between the demands of the organization (bureaucracy) and the drive for professionalism. The paper explores the emergence of the bureaucratic-

professional tension for supervisors and curricularists, explains its influence on these two functionaries, and indicates the persistence of this problem. Indeed, it is the thesis of this paper that the bureaucratic-professional tension has remained a vital concern among supervisors and curriculum people in our schools to this very day. Evidencing the omnipresent nature of this tension is not difficult. For example, one day while undertaking the research for this paper I was listening to radio station WMCA in New York City. WMCA airs a talk show on which listeners are able to call the station to discuss various issues and problems of the day. One of the callers, while I was listening, discussed "the shameful and deplorable conditions of the public school system." The caller discussed the recent court case involving Dr. Howard Hurwitz who was principal of Long Island City High School in New York. Dr. Hurwitz was brought up on charges of insubordination for not following a directive from the central office to restore a student whom he had expelled. The radio commentator agreed with the caller that the Hurwitz case was indicative of "the sorry state of the schools in New York City." The caller then went on to say that he wished the bureaucrats in the Board of Education would allow professionals such as Dr. Hurwitz to supervise the educational process as well as maintain their professional outlook.

In effect, the caller was alluding to the bureaucratic-professional tension that is central to this study. One of the points I would like to make is that although, as the Hurwitz case indicates, the bureaucratic-professional problem is still with us, it was not my intention in undertaking this study to explore this problem as a preconceived notion. Indeed, the concepts of bureaucracy and professionalism were not in my vocabulary in terms of school supervision and curriculum. Rather, it was my intention, generally, to explore supervision and curriculum historically. This is a point I would like very much to convey in light of Professor

Ravitch's scathing critique of radical revisionists and their "politicized" interpretation of history.[13] In addition, words such as "professionalism" and "bureaucracy" are not used in this paper in their pejorative sense but merely as descriptors; that is, ways of interpreting and describing past events.[14]

The origins of this dilemma emerge in the late nineteenth century with the function of supervision. In a paper entitled "Controlling the Schools: An Essay on the Bureaucratization of Supervision in the Late Nineteenth Century," delivered last year before the AERA meeting, I argued that supervision became the chief bureaucratic mechanism, used by superintendents, to gain as well as maintain control over urban city schools. The bureaucratization of supervision was undertaken by the nineteenth century reformer to standardize, centralize, control, and bring order to an urban school system beset by incompetency, inefficiency, and political influence. The pervasiveness of bureaucratic methods characterized the nature and conception of supervision in the late nineteenth century.[15] Bureaucratic organization profoundly affected the school curriculum as well. Courses of study, selection of textbooks, and other matters related to the instructional aspects of schooling were controlled in the latter part of the nineteenth century by the school superintendent. Curriculum development during this time was minimal and episodic. The duty of the supervisor was to carry out the rigid and fixed courses of study determined by the superintendent. One superintendent emphatically stated in 1875 that "nonconformity . . . can not be tolerated without great danger to the system." "Two things should be absolutely forbidden," continued the superintendent, "the use of any textbook not in the prescribed list, and the study of any subject not included in the prescribed course. To allow either of these things to be done is to sanction the gradual disorganization of a graded-school."[16] John Dewey, in a probing essay in 1901, decried the pervasive bureaucratic orientation of the

course of study by warning that "to enact that at a given date all the grades of a certain city shall have nature study is to invite confusion and distraction."[17] The fact that the curriculum increased its uniformity and rigidity does not imply that educators were not concerned with the course of study. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that curricular matters were important to educators. William Torrey Harris stated that "The question of the course of study is the most important question which the educator has before him."[18] Systematic attention to curriculum became a national concern in the late nineteenth century. However, research indicates that although educators were concerned with the course of study and what went on in schools, they were chiefly interested in structural, administrative reform to achieve their goal of standardization and uniformity of urban education. Beginning at least by 1890 and continuing through to the end of the century, the superintendent used the curriculum and supervision as chief bases for legitimizing his control over schooling.[19] The transformation of the school system in the late nineteenth century along bureaucratic lines had an incalculable influence on curriculum and supervision.

The bureaucratic influence continued into the twentieth century.[20] Both supervision and curriculum, however, underwent significant changes after 1900.[21] In a study entitled "From Bureaucracy to Professionalism: An Essay on the Democratization of Supervision in the Early Twentieth Century," delivered before the AESA meeting, I indicated that there was a concerted effort by supervisors and curricularists to direct their emphasis away from bureaucratic procedures to a more professional and democratic outlook. I discussed three factors that led supervisors, in particular, to professionalize. First, supervisors during the first two decades of the twentieth century realized the tenuous position they occupied in the hierarchical school organization. The ill-defined nature of supervision and the indefinite and obscure status of supervisors within

schools contributed to the attempt to find legitimacy for their work. Second, supervisors sought to professionalize as a result of mounting criticism leveled by teachers and other educators against rating and other bureaucratic devices used for measuring "teacher efficiency." Third, supervisors sought to professionalize in order to distinguish their work from administration. The supervisor's quest for professional status to combat bureaucratic and authoritarian principles assumed unprecedented importance after 1920. Professionalism as a process affecting both supervisors and curriculum people represented, especially during the twenties and thirties, a concerted effort to achieve some sort of internal organization, guidelines for expertise, professional training, a strong political power base, and control over their work. Undoubtedly, the advocated theory supported the democratization and professionalization of supervision. The evidence suggests, however, that despite apparent strides, particularly in the newly acquired national prominence of the supervisory organization, the drive toward professional autonomy remained largely illusory. It was during this period that supervision realized, to some extent, the problem or dilemma of seeking professional status within a demanding, bureaucratic organization.[22]

The curriculum person came to a similar understanding. Having established the administrative structure of schooling, schoolmen turned their attention to more internal and technical educational matters. As a result, interest in curriculum grew steadily after the turn of the century. The work of Thorndike, Strayer and Terman, Bobbitt's work in Los Angeles as well as his important book titled The Curriculum, curriculum revisions in Denver and Detroit, the formation of curriculum bureaus, and the important role played by national committees as well as the growing state curriculum projects evidences the attention given to curriculum.[23] In place of Payne, Harris, McMurray, and Butler were men such as Kilpatrick, Charters, Harap, Rugg and Counts who were now concerned with curriculum.[24]

The professionalization of curriculum was enhanced by the publication of two volumes by the National Society for the Study of Education in 1926.[25] Curriculum, at this point in time, had become a "self-conscious area of specialization."[26] Curricularists however, seeking to maintain professionalism, encountered certain problems. Decker Walker, in his important essay entitled "Straining to Lift Ourselves," discusses the dysfunctional organizational framework established by the early founders of the curriculum field. Walker notes:

> The primary professional was placed within the regular school district administrative hierarchy - above the teachers and below the superintendent - and was made responsible for organizing committees to handle curriculum revision for all the schools in the district and for all subjects, for supervising the operations of these committees, and for disseminating the results through the staff. The burden of these duties was so great that no time remained for research or scholarship . . . the curriculum worker had to depend upon the superintendent for authority to act, and upon the teaching staff to conduct the bulk of the curriculum development. So the local specialist was expected to exercise leadership without power . . . .
> As a result, the primary professional role became that of a bureaucratic functionary, overseeing periodic revisions of courses of study . . . . At best the local curriculum specialist was a gate-keeper operating within the bureaucracy . . . .

Walker concludes his discussion of the professional curriculum specialist working within the confines of a bureaucracy by stating that they were "condemned to inefficacy by the location of their influence in the limbo of middle management."[27]

Toward the middle thirties, supervisors and curriculum workers recognized the bureaucratic-professional problem. They began to sense the problem of being members at the lower end of the educational hierarchy. They realized that their recognition as a profession was hampered by their vulnerable position in the school organization. Supervisors and curricularists wanted to improve instruction and make more valid curriculum but were hindered by bureaucratic rules and regulations. They knew it was difficult to become professionals when the demands of the bureaucracy were so great. My analysis of this history indicates the tensions created

for them by membership in a bureaucratic organization.

Nonetheless, supervisors and curricularists did not lessen their attempts to achieve professional status. They sought to strengthen their position in schools through organizational means; an alliance, they thought, would increase their political clout to attain their goal of professionalism. This attempt was epitomized by the convergence of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study in 1937 to work on a yearbook on curriculum.[28] The major effect of this joint effort was the realization by many educators that curriculum development and supervision were related functions requiring one strong organization. The future attempts at merger represented their efforts to strengthen their professional status.

The important point to be stressed is that supervisors and curriculum workers sought to become professionals within a bureaucratic framework. They realized that their organizational membership restricted certain professional needs. But their remedy was to strengthen their positions in the bureaucracy by attempting to manipulate rather than transform the structural aspects of the organization. In other words, professionalism was conceived as a means to gain legitimacy within the bureaucracy. They did not envision their professional interests as inimical to bureaucratic operations, although they often were. They never wished to alter fundamental bureaucratic role relationships in schools. They believed in the bureaucracy. Supervisors and curriculum people envisioned that professionalism would mitigate harmful bureaucratic tendencies. Therefore, they sought bureaucratic means to counteract bureaucratic tendencies - a dubious panacea. (Importantly, even if professionalism fully materialized for them, the problem of being professionals at low levels of the bureaucracy was never recognized nor rectified.)

Given the exigencies of the organizational framework of schooling and, of course, their perception of it, it is doubtful that supervisors

and curricularists ever had a chance to attain their professional goals. The query that comes to mind is, "is it possible to become a professional within a bureaucracy?" Embedded in this question are perhaps more fundamental queries: "In what way does the bureaucracy inhibit and stifle individual autonomy and professional behavior of its members?"; "Why did supervisors and curricularists adopt bureaucratic means?"; "Did they in fact have an alternative?"; "Why did they seek professional status within a bureaucracy which, by its very nature, was programmed to neutralize the autonomy, individuality and professional behavior of its participants?"; "Why, indeed, the persistence of bureaucracy?" I do not presume to have an answer to these questions. Rather, by discussing this bureaucratic-professional problem in an interpretive mode, perhaps some issues can be more clearly understood. Perhaps, we will come to question the inevitability of the bureaucratic framework and search for alternative forms of management. In the past, in my estimation, educators did not adequately confront these possibilities. The history of supervision and curriculum, if it has any meaning at all, demonstrates the necessity for educators today to examine the bureaucratic framework of schooling in a more deliberate and meaningful way than has been done in the past.

NOTES

1. Henry Warren Button's study of supervision, although until recently the best general study of the field, thoroughly neglects curriculum as a valuable source into supervisory practice. He states that "the functions of supervision and of developing curriculum seem to have followed separate paths, so disparate as to make the consideration of both in a single study exceedingly cumbersome." See Henry Warren Button, "A History of Supervision in the Public Schools, 1870-1950" (Doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1961, p. 3). Even the recent ASCD yearbook, a volume devoted to historical inquiry, has given insufficient attention to supervision apart from curriculum development from a historical perspective. See O. L. Davis, Jr., ed. Perspectives on Curriculum Development, 1776-1976 (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1976).

2. I am grateful to Hollis L. Caswell for pointing this out to me in personal correspondence dated December 7, 1976.

3. According to a recent publication of ASCD entitled Curriculum Leaders: Improving Their Influence (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1976, p. 13), "a definitive history of educational supervision has not been published." To be sure, there is ample published documentary material relating to many aspects of public school supervision. Unfortunately, one must concur with the statement quoted above which indicates the lack of historical inquiry into "educational supervision." Recently, I posited that "supervision as a field of study has little by way of history." See Jeffrey Glanz, "Ahistoricism and School Supervision: Notes Toward a History," Educational Leadership 35 (November 1977), p. 154. Perusal of any text, however, on supervision as well as some curriculum books should give the reader a broad overview of the history of supervision. Much of this history, regretably, is sketchy, general, and, at times, inaccurate. The best descriptive history of supervision was completed in 1961 by Henry Warren Button, under the sponsorship of Raymond Callahan at Washington University, titled "A History of Supervision in the Public Schools, 1870-1950." My study of supervision entitled "Bureaucracy and Professionalism: An Historical Interpretation of Public School Supervision in the United States, 1875-1937" (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977), although by no means a comprehensive treatment on the subject, does attempt to analyze and interpret certain developments occurring from the late nineteenth century through the fourth decade of the twentieth century. A number of other studies are sorely needed on a wide range of topics dealing with public school supervision.

4. For further insight into late nineteenth century supervisory developments see my paper "Controlling the Schools: An Essay on the Bureaucratization of School Supervision in the Late Nineteenth Century," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March 20, 1978.

5. Since Herbert M. Kliebard, in an article entitled "Curriculum Past and Curriculum Present," Educational Leadership 33 (January 1976), p. 245, charged that "curriculum as a field of study has little by way of history," the number of studies in curriculum have markedly increased. The reader interested in a broad overview should consult

Mary Louise Seguel's The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967). A far more analytical treatment is given by Daniel Tanner and Laurel Tanner, Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1975). For a more specific and critical treatment see Barry M. Franklin, "The Curriculum Field and the Problem of Social Control, 1918-1938: A Study in Critical Theory" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1974). For an insightful essay into the founding of the curriculum field see Decker F. Walker, "The Curriculum Field in Formation: A Review of the 26th Yearbook of the NSSE," Curriculum Theory Network 4 (1975): 263-80. The interested reader is also urged to consult Herbert M. Kliebard, "Systematic Curriculum Development, 1890-1959," Unpublished paper, NIE Curriculum Task Force, 1976. It should be noted that although the number of historical studies in curriculum has increased, there has been considerable disagreement, recently, concerning the nature and boundaries of curriculum history. See, for example, Barry M. Franklin, "Curriculum History: Its Nature and Boundaries," Curriculum Inquiry 7 (1977): 67-79 and O. L. Davis, Jr., "The Nature and Boundaries of Curriculum History," Curriculum Inquiry 7 (1977): 157-68.

6. Decker F. Walker, "Straining to Lift Ourselves: A Critique of the Foundations of the Curriculum Field," Curriculum Theory Network 5 (1975), p. 17.

7. The issue of the emergence of the curriculum field has been a hotly debated one. Mary L. Seguel, in her The Curriculum Field, sees the McMurrays, representatives of Herbartian theory, as pioneers of the curriculum field. Herbert Kliebard, "The Curriculum Field in Retrospect," in Technology and the Curriculum, ed. Paul Witt (Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968), states that the curriculum field emerged in some sort of systematic way in the 1920s. Two years later, Kliebard stated that "there is some justification for dating the emergence of the curriculum field . . . from around the year 1918." See Herbert M. Kliebard, "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective," Educational Comment (1970): 31-41. Others have set back the date of the development of the curriculum field to the late nineteenth century. Lawrence A. Cremin, "Curriculum-Making in the U.S.," Teachers College Record 73 (December 1971): 207-20, sees the work of William Torrey Harris as the focal point of curriculum field discourse. Walter Doyle suggests that the curriculum field became prominent beginning around 1890. He states that "the curriculum field was launched and shaped within the larger drive to professionalize schooling." See Walter Doyle, "Education for All: The Triumph of Professionalism," in Perspectives on Curriculum Development, (ASCD). I believe that determining the precise date of the emergence of the curriculum field is less important than analyzing the specific factors that have shaped and influenced curriculum discourse over time.

8. A result of this new idea or concept was an alliance between the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study to form the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development. Later the name was changed to the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). At the same time this development was occurring there were other major changes across the country. For example, the State Department

of Education in Virginia was reorganized to bring curriculum development and supervision together under one administrative head. Significantly, the organization of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College was stimulated by the same concept.

9. I believe this question deserves much greater attention than can possibly be given in a 15-20 minute presentation. O. L. Davis, Jr. recently attempted to explore the forces, trends and personalities whose interactions resulted in the merger in 1943 to form ASCD. Davis gives an accurate account of the "how" but does not delve deeply into the "why" of the merger. See "Symbol of a Shift from Status to Function: Formation of the ASCD," Educational Leadership 35 (May 1978): 609-14. We need studies that go beyond Davis' superficial account of the merger. My attempt to answer the "why" of this question in this paper also needs further research and study. My attempt to explore this question is based on an initial effort undertaken in a doctoral study. See Chapter VI, titled "The Alliance Between Supervisors and Curriculum Workers: The Quest for Professionalism Revisited," of my dissertation.

10. Efforts to combine supervisory methods with curriculum revision took place as early as 1914 in the Detroit public schools. Stuart A. Courtis, "Curriculum Construction at Detroit," in Curriculum-Making: Past and Present, 26th Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1926), pp. 189, 194, describes the Detroit system as "a highly centralized organization, democratically administered." Courtis discusses the role of the supervisor in curriculum revision. Perhaps the classic plan which best coordinated the activities of supervision and curriculum took place in Denver beginning in the 1920s under the leadership of Jesse Newlon, superintendent of schools, and later president of the NEA, and A. L. Threlkeld, deputy superintendent of schools in charge of supervision. Newlon's democratically administered organization fostered curriculum experimentation, continuous curriculum revision, and teacher and supervisory participation. Newlon and Threlkeld believed that the administration had a definite role to play in curriculum revision. They thought it was the responsibility of the administration to bring "curricula, as regards content, methods of teaching, and administrative procedures, as nearly as possible into line with the best educational knowledge and practice. . . ." "The problem of administration of a school system," wrote Newlon and Threlkeld in 1927, was establishing the proper environment for the course of study to function effectively. See Jesse H. Newlon and A.L. Threlkeld, "The Denver Curriculum-Revision Program," 26th Yearbook of the NSSE, Part I, pp. 229, 240. In Denver, supervision had a significant role to play as well. Supervisors coordinated committees working on curriculum revision. Newlon believed that an important factor in curriculum revision at Denver was that teachers were actively involved and that they welcomed more supervision. See Jesse H. Newlon, "Outcomes of the Curriculum Program," NEA Proceedings, 1925, p. 803. Newlon's success, in part, can be attributed to his belief that teacher participation in curriculum revision was essential. For a description of Newlon's program, see Gary L. Peltier, "Teacher Participation in Curriculum Revision: An Historical Case Study," History of Education Quarterly 8 (Summer 1967): 209-19. The idea that curriculum development and supervision should be coordinated quickly spread. See, for example, A.L. Threlkeld, "The Place of Curriculum Construction in the Supervisory Program,"

in Educational Supervision, 1st Yearbook of the National Conference on Educational Method, (N.Y.: Teachers College, 1928): 216-18, and A.H. Horrall, "The Supervisor's Function in Relation to Curriculum Making," California Journal of Elementary Education II (August 1933): 150-53. Additional documentation can be found in my dissertation, pp. 306-321.

11. Walker, "Straining to Lift Ourselves," pp. 16, 18.

12. Jeffrey Glanz, "From Bureaucracy to Professionalism: An Essay on the Democratization of School Supervision in the Early Twentieth Century," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Washington, D.C., November 2, 1978.

13. Diane Ravitch, "The Revisionists Revised: Studies in the Historiography of American Education," Proceedings of the National Academy of Education 4 (1977): 1-84.

14. Nor am I discussing bureaucracy and professionalism in the same sense that other scholars have. For example, Blau and Scotts' construct of bureaucracy and professionalism did not have any impact on my study. Any similarity to Blau and Scotts' construct is wholly coincidental. See Peter M. Blau and Richard W. Scott, Formal Organizations: A Corporative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler Co., 1962).

15. For greater insight into the bureaucratization of supervision in the late nineteenth century see my "Controlling the Schools, ..." AERA paper, 1978.

16. William H. Payne, Chapters on School Supervision (N.Y.: Wilson, Hinkle & Co., 1875), p. 53.

17. John Dewey, "The Situation as Regards the Course of Study," Educational Review XXII (June 1901): 26-49.

18. William T. Harris, Fourteenth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1868 (St. Louis: George Knapp, 1869), p. 94.

19. For a discussion of how the curriculum was used for asserting the efficacy of schooling see Gerald A. Ponder and Walter Doyle, "Efficacy by Assertion: An Essay on the Significance of the Curriculum Field," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977. For a discussion of how supervision was used to control schooling see my "Controlling the Schools, ..." AERA paper, 1978.

20. For a general discussion of the historical development of bureaucracy in urban education from the late nineteenth century thru the early decades of the twentieth century see David B. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974). For a discussion of how bureaucratic thought influenced curriculum see Herbert M. Kliebard, "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory," in Freedom, Bureaucracy, and Schooling, ed. Vernon F. Haubrich (Washington, D.C.:ASCD, 1971).

21. The function of supervision, before 1900, was primarily controlled and performed by the school superintendent. The supervisors that

did exist before 1900 were merely persons whom were given minimal supervisory responsibility by the superintendent. As centralization became more widespread after the turn of the century, the need for more supervision was apparent. The superintendent could no longer visit, inspect, and supervise schools personally as he could, for example, in a small rural community of nineteenth century America. Several administrative and supervisory positions had to be established in order to meet the growing needs of a complex, bureaucratic school system. Supervisors, general and special, and principals who bore responsibility for supervising teachers, increased in number as the school system grew in size and complexity. Supervision after 1900, then, became the responsibility of a functionary other than the superintendent. The number of curriculum specialists also increased after the turn of the century. For a good discussion of both the university-based curriculum theorist and the school-based curriculum worker see Walker, "The Curriculum Field in Formation," and "Straining to Lift Ourselves," 1975.

22. For more detail see my "From Bureaucracy to Professionalism, ..." AESA paper, 1978.

23. See Seguel, The Curriculum Field, 1967, Tanner and Tanner, Curriculum Development, 1975, and Hollis L. Caswell, "Emergence of the Curriculum as a Field of Professional Work and Study," in Precedents and Promise in the Curriculum Field, ed. H.F. Robison (N.Y.: Teachers College Press, 1966): 1-21.

24. These people arduously worked toward forming some sort of curriculum group. Around 1929, a group of college professors, under the leadership of Henry Harap, then of Western Reserve University, banded together to form the National Society of Curriculum Workers. Three years later, after a merger with a public school curriculum group, chaired by Walter Cocking, then professor of education at George Peabody College, the new association was called the Society for Curriculum Study. The Society published mimeographed news bulletins from 1931 to 1935. The bulletins consisted of brief descriptions of the curricular activities of people like Harap, Charters, Courtis and Cocking.

25. See National Society for the Study of Education, Curriculum Making: Past and Present, part I, and The Foundations and Technique of Curriculum-Construction, part II.

26. Arthur W. Foshay and Lois A. Beilin, "Curriculum," Review of Educational Research, 1969, p. 275.

27. Walker, "Straining to Lift Ourselves," pp. 16, 17, 18.

28. For accounts of the forming of both groups see Davis, "Symbol of a Shift from Status to Function, ..." 1978, Galen Saylor, "The Founding of the ASCD," 1976, mimeographed. Original sources, such as bulletins, journals and books published by the groups, provide much information. The joint effort, which culminated in 1943 in the formation of ASCD, was begun early in 1936. Paul Rankin, of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, and C.L. Cushman, of the Society for Curriculum Study, met in February of that year to discuss plans to work on a joint yearbook on curriculum construction. Final arrangements were made and a group

of ten people formed the Joint Committee. The chairman, Henry Harap, stated that "all the conferences were held in an atmosphere of comfort, friendliness, and geniality, but pleasantness did not dull the edge of criticism." The result of the joint effort was the publishing of a book on curriculum. See Joint Committee on Curriculum of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study, The Changing Curriculum (D. Appleton-Century Co., 1937). Although there were those who objected to merger, an alliance between both groups seemed inevitable. In May 1943, shortly before both groups merged, the editorial in the Curriculum Journal read, in part, as follows: "The editor feels somewhat like the parent who is about to give away a favorite child in marriage. He approves his going, but parts with him reluctantly." See Editorial, "Hail and Farewell," Curriculum Journal XIV (May 1943): 193. Also, see "Program of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction," Educational Method XXII (May 1943): 344-53. The general feeling at the time was that the merger would unquestionably "establish a strong, viable, dynamic organization." As I've stated earlier, a more indepth analysis is needed into this crucial merger between these two prominent educational groups. I believe the turning point toward merger was the joint effort that produced The Changing Curriculum. I am currently working on an analysis of this volume and its impact on the merger. The paper is tentatively titled "The Quest for Professionalism: A Review of The Changing Curriculum, The Joint Yearbook of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction and the Society for Curriculum Study."